

## Comments on 1/10/04 draft of Chapter 6

P 2, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, sentence beginning with “However...” suggest to be revised:

However, additional statewide storage projects and conveyance features are still being evaluated and could be more than 10 years before these are fully implemented. Reasons for longer implementation times include.....technical feasibility, generating public support, as well as the complexities...

Even though the “how and when” texts are placeholder, I raise my comments for staff to consider.

P. 6, #3, Regions should continue... where ~~possible~~ applicable on a region-wide and watershed basis.

P. 6, #4, sentence with “As part of that, the State...”, why just talk about storage? Shouldn’t it be the whole CALFED ROD stage 1 actions?

P. 7, #5, under “how” – not sure what you mean by “incorporate into IRPs” and “coincidental with IRP development?” We are talking about state’s infrastructure plans, but IRPs are with the regions.

P.8, #4, under “how” – “Continue to address...processed ~~up to and~~ including modeling...”

P.9, #9, Not sure what the first sentence means. Public agencies already take public trust into account when planning projects and the CEQA and NEPA processes address the issue.

P. 9, #10, Why do we need another team? Isn’t that the job of the Resource Agency?

P. 10, #12, Maybe biting too much. Should first evaluate the method to ensure consistency of data and forum for exchange.

P. 11, #14, Isn’t that already required by law?

Tracking Implementation section is a good start. It needs to go further and have a timeline and workplan for developing performance measures as indicators of the state’s health with respect to water issues. Measuring activities can be a part, but not a good indicator of health.